

2005 NAIP Survey
Executive Summary
For
California

USDA
Farm Service Agency

Aerial Photography Field Office

March 2006

Contents

Section	Pages
1.0 Introduction	3
1.1 Purpose and Scope	
1.2 Survey Submittals	
2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary	4-5
Executive Summary Supplemental Documents (Detached):	
Executive Summary Supplemental 1 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 13 (MS Word)	
Executive Summary Supplemental 2 – NAIP Survey Text Comments for Question 14 (MS Word)	

Section 1

1.0 Introduction

The primary purpose of NAIP is to acquire peak growing season “leaf on” imagery, and deliver this imagery to United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) County Service Centers in order to maintain Common Land Unit (CLU) boundaries and assist with crop compliance and a multitude of other farm programs.

As evidenced by the types of customers requesting NAIP imagery, the imagery has other purposes as well. Although our primary customers are States and County Service Centers, other uses for NAIP imagery, including military, real estate, recreation, planning, etc., cannot be overlooked.

NAIP is a program with a relatively short history, beginning with pilot projects in 2001 and 2002, and moving to full volume acquisition in 2003 to 2005, based on funding and partnering. NAIP is moving out of the research and development phase and into sustainment status. By moving into a sustainment phase, a program can build and evaluate a quality business process, and stabilize. Part of this process is evaluating how NAIP is working for its primary customers.

1.1 Purpose and Scope

The focus of this document is to assess in a qualitative manner how NAIP is satisfying customer needs in California. In other words, “How did APFO do in providing *useful* NAIP imagery for its primary customer?” Answering this question comprises the purpose and scope.

1.2 Survey Submittals

For the initial disposition, the following States were sent surveys to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: WA, OR, OK, KS, NE, MO, IA, MN, WI, IL, IN, OH, CT, and NC. No responses were received from KS or AZ by the 15 Dec 2005 due date. WA noted that they would respond to the survey, but due to imagery delivery/redelivery dates, responses would likely be after 15 Dec.

A second waive of surveys was sent to the following States to disseminate to County Service Centers for completion: CA, CO, MT, ND, SD, TX, LA, MS, AL, GA, FL, SC, VA, MD, PA, MI, RI, and CT. Responses were requested by 17 Feb, and by 9 Mar for select states which received imagery “late”. Surveys were accidentally sent to CT twice, however, County Service Centers only responded once. LA noted that they would only be able to get a few Counties to complete the survey by the 9 Mar due date. MI noted they would not be able to participate in the survey because of CIR rework that would be completed after the survey due date. MT noted that due to the late distribution of imagery, surveys would likely be returned after the 9 Mar due date. During the second waive of surveys, no survey responses were received by CO, GA, MI, or AL. Surveys received after 9 Mar 06 were not scored.

Section 2

2.0 Qualitative Evaluation Summary

NAIP Assessment Surveys were provided by email to County Service Centers via the State Office and responses were requested by 9 Mar 06. Out of the responses received, in California, 968 of a possible 1380 points were achieved, for a weighted average score out of 1.0 of .701, for a rating of 70.1%. Translated into survey terms, this is an overall rating of “Satisfied”. The map on the following page graphically represents overall survey results by county. These results indicate that generally the counties that participated in the survey were satisfied with 2005 NAIP and that the products met customer needs most of the time. However, there is room for improvement.

Most textual comments from the survey revolved around color quality/resolution, and timing of imagery acquisition and delivery. Textual comments can be found in the Executive Summary Supplementals 1 and 2. A statistical summary by question of survey results is shown below. Note that Q1-8 are out of a possible 5 points and Q9-10 are out of a possible 10 points. Statistically, the lowest average scoring question was Q1, “Was the imagery received by your office in time to be useful for crop compliance work?” Statistically, the highest scoring question was Q4, “Is the imagery useful for CLU maintenance?”

Q1		Q2		Q3		Q4		Q5	
Mean	2.54166667	Mean	3.48	Mean	4.434782609	Mean	4.5	Mean	3.458333333
Standard Error	0.329575741	Standard Error	0.289367126	Standard Error	0.186777191	Standard Error	0.18057878	Standard Error	0.275701784
Median	2	Median	4	Median	5	Median	5	Median	4
Mode	1	Mode	4	Mode	5	Mode	5	Mode	3
Standard Deviation	1.614584794	Standard Deviation	1.446835628	Standard Deviation	0.895751942	Standard Deviation	0.884651737	Standard Deviation	1.350657382
Sample Variance	2.606884058	Sample Variance	2.093333333	Sample Variance	0.802371542	Sample Variance	0.782608696	Sample Variance	1.824275362
Kurtosis	-1.377947754	Kurtosis	-0.925305519	Kurtosis	9.611374076	Kurtosis	10.53198653	Kurtosis	-0.365840156
Skewness	0.560662547	Skewness	-0.674559131	Skewness	-2.69549718	Skewness	-2.877352114	Skewness	-0.712307658
Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	4
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5
Sum	61	Sum	87	Sum	102	Sum	108	Sum	83
Count	24	Count	25	Count	23	Count	24	Count	24
Q6		Q7		Q8		Q9_X2		Q10_X2	
Mean	4.153846154	Mean	3.133333333	Mean	4	Mean	6.25	Mean	6.083333333
Standard Error	0.197618963	Standard Error	0.36340541	Standard Error	0.241825417	Standard Error	0.555766868	Standard Error	0.570775809
Median	4	Median	4	Median	4	Median	6	Median	6
Mode	5	Mode	4	Mode	4	Mode	4	Mode	6
Standard Deviation	1.007662947	Standard Deviation	1.407463101	Standard Deviation	1.054092553	Standard Deviation	2.722690485	Standard Deviation	2.796218979
Sample Variance	1.015384615	Sample Variance	1.980952381	Sample Variance	1.111111111	Sample Variance	7.413043478	Sample Variance	7.81884058
Kurtosis	3.000089831	Kurtosis	-0.982732135	Kurtosis	2.964705882	Kurtosis	-1.207186756	Kurtosis	-1.184342551
Skewness	-1.601365187	Skewness	-0.801938057	Skewness	-1.590439647	Skewness	-0.019387413	Skewness	0.023924077
Range	4	Range	4	Range	4	Range	8	Range	8
Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	1	Minimum	2	Minimum	2
Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	5	Maximum	10	Maximum	10
Sum	108	Sum	47	Sum	76	Sum	150	Sum	146
Count	26	Count	15	Count	19	Count	24	Count	24

2005 NAIP - Overall Qualitative Survey Results

